



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

42. <sup>11u</sup>Nergal rikis amati šiati lū tarakkis.

"Incantation: Šamaš, king of the ghosts! The ghost which frightens him, which since many days face and front opposes, is seen: face and front opposes, is seen. Oh Šamaš, god of visions, goddess of dreams behold; faithfully thou dost not reveal thyself; thou art god of visions, goddess of dreams. He that crushes the proud art thou. The curse of Ea ram of the sea, ram of the sea, oh great lord Šamaš speak and it shall be changed. Oh thou named by the gods, god of visions, goddess of dreams, seize him away. Oh Ninkigal and Ninazu may he not be unbound. Oh Nergal the bonds of this affair bind."

[No. 1, Col. I, l. 18, read inâ-ši-na, "their eyes." A prayer of Asarhaddon to the sungod is BM, 83, 1-18, 477, to be published by the reviewer soon. Additional correction.]

S. LANGDON

#### KING'S BABYLONIAN BOUNDARY STONES<sup>1</sup>

The long-expected book of King on the *Babylonian Boundary Stones and Memorial Tablets*, in possession of the British Museum, has at last made its appearance. It is an excellent publication which fully meets our expectations.

The work consists of two volumes, the first of which contains the transliterations, translations, and discussions of forty documents. (The list on p. xvii gives but 39, but No. 91001 pl. C. has been omitted.) The second volume is an atlas of CVII+26 plates. The latter present both the symbols as well as the text of the majority of the inscriptions in excellent halftone reproductions, which enable the student to form an independent judgment as to the condition of the text. They deserve praise for their clearness and fine execution and only rarely leave the reader dependent upon the transliteration of the editor. Twenty-two documents are reproduced by photographic process; twenty-one were drawn by hand and reproduced by lithography. Three documents (Nos. 90833, 90922, 102588) are given both by photographic and lithographic process.

The work of King gives the text of nine complete or nearly complete Kudurru inscriptions, eight of which had been published before. The Kudurru of Gula-eresh (No. XI, pp. 76-79, pls. I-IV) is entirely new. Besides King publishes for the first time the text of twelve fragments of Kudurrus, including the earliest thus far published of the reign of Kadashman-Enlil, as well as some of the latest, from the neo-Babylonian period. Of two Kudurrus (Nos. XVI, XVII) no text has been preserved.

Of stone tablets, recording deeds and charters, the book contains ten. Three of these had been published before (Nos. XXIV, XXV, XXVIII).

<sup>1</sup> BABYLONIAN BOUNDARY STONES AND MEMORIAL TABLETS IN THE BRITISH MUSEUM. Edited by L. W. King, M.A., London: British Museum, 1912. Vol. I, pp. xvii+136 fol.; Vol. II, Atlas of Plates, CVII halftones and 26 lithographs.

Of the rest two deserve special mention. The first is a deed, dated in the twelfth year of Simmash-Shipak. It is the first and only known document of the Vth Babylonian dynasty. The second is a deed, dated in the reign of [Itti]-Marduk-balâtu, a king who becomes known to us for the first time through this tablet.

The last part of the volume consists of five miscellaneous texts, two of which (No. XXXVI, *a* and *b*) had been published before.

The work of King has a twofold value and importance. It makes accessible a considerable number of texts, namely twenty-three, which had been unpublished before, and it presents the texts already published in a much more perfect form. Even in such texts as III R 41 and III R 43 (Nos. VII and VIII of King's book), which have often been studied by scholars, at least a few corrections are given, e.g., III R 41, I, 17 (King, p. 39, l. 17) reads 30 kaspu, instead of 130 kaspu; col. I, 27 (King, p. 40, l. 27) reads 716 kaspu, instead of 816 kaspu; III R 43, I, 27 (King, p. 44, l. 27) reads (arḥu) *Uluu*, instead of (arḥu) *Airu*; III R 45, No. 2, l. 7 (King, p. 50, l. 7), *ša-ki mâti*, instead of *daianu*; l. 20 (King, p. 51, l. 20) *bâb nâri-šu*, instead of [—] *nâri-šu*; l. 21, *ši-bit al-pi*, instead of *immeru(?)u alpi*; l. 22 *ši-bit ši-en-ni*, instead of *ina ši-bit ši-en-ni*, although in the last two corrections I had already anticipated him, see *Selected Babylonian Kudurru Inscriptions* ("Semitic Study Series," Vol. XIV), p. 40.

Other texts, like London 103 (now No. 90827), see King, No. III, pp. 7–18, and London 101 (now No. 90829), see King, No. IV, pp. 19–23, have been corrected in literally dozens of passages, so that now for the first time we can follow their statements in detail.

But the most brilliant work was done for London 102 (now No. 90835), see King, No. IX, pp. 51–69, whose text as edited by Belser (*BA*, Vol. II, pp. 171–85) was practically useless. King discovered the true sequence of the various sections, recovered whole lines, which Belser had been unable to decipher (probably because of unfavorable light, under which he had to work), and thus King has given us, if not an entirely complete text, at least one which enables us to follow the complicated history of the estate of Burusha, which it relates. For this excellent work King deserves great credit.

But although King has contributed much toward giving us reliable texts, their final form has not yet been reached. There are still numerous obscure passages, unintelligible grammatical forms, unknown words, and other problems to tax the ingenuity of students. Some of them may never be solved, owing to the broken and imperfect condition of the stones themselves. In others progress is possible.

I cannot show my interest in the splendid work of King any better than by giving a series of notes to the various texts. For convenience' sake I shall follow the arrangement which King adopted in his volume of transliterated and translated texts.

P. 5, l. 1, 10 Gur zêru GAN 30(qa). I cannot share the confidence of King (see p. xiii) that this passage establishes definitely the equation  $\text{𐤂} = \text{GAN} = \text{I GAN}$ , for a writer who is as careless as the engraver of this stone can hardly be relied upon in a crucial test case like this. In this very first line he makes four other mistakes. He ought to have written: 10 GUR (še'u) zêru I GAN 30 (qa) I ammatu rabîtu(-tu) ugar (a<sup>lu</sup>) DUR-AN-KI, instead of: 10 GUR zêru GAN 30 (qa) ammatu rabîtu ugar (a<sup>lu</sup>) DUR-AN. King himself refers repeatedly to the carelessness of the engraver, see p. 6, n. 7, n. 10; p. 7, n. 1, n. 3, n. 4. The omission of the horizontal wedge before GAN is therefore simply a scribal error, and we cannot base an argument upon it. If it occurred in a text otherwise without any mistakes the case would be different.

P. 5, l. 2, bi-ri-it (nâru) Da-ba-an. It is better to read **𐤁𐤁𐤀**-ba-an, for as Hommel has pointed out (*Geographie*, p. 296) the form **𐤁𐤁** (= **𐤁𐤁**)-ba-an occurs.

P. 6, l. 8, pâtu šaplu. King uses throughout his book the form šaplu, but that is certainly an oversight. It must surely be šaplû, for according to Brünnow, No. 9673, KI-TA is šap-lu-u.

P. 7, l. 23, (i<sup>lu</sup>) Tišpak. Why not Tišhu? The gloss to (ilu) **𐤈𐤍** is not Ti-iš-pa-ak, but Ti-iš-hu, see Br. 3022; *CT*, XII, 11, No. 92691, rev. III, 34, and the abbreviated name Te-iš-hu-um, quoted by Ranke, *Personal Names*, p. 207.

P. 10, l. 21, aḥê (pl.) marê (pl.). In the third dynasty, as in the first, the plural of aḥu and abu were aḥḥû and abbû, see Meissner, *Grammatik*, § 41, k; and notice the following forms: In this very text (see King, p. 11, l. 33) occurs the plural ab-bi-e-šu-nu; also in Clay, *BE*, XIV, 39, l. 10, we read ab-bu-û-a, "my fathers," and l. 16, aḥ-ḥi-e-šu, "his brothers." The same text, l. 14, has the proper name (i<sup>lu</sup>) NIN-IB-nâdin-aḥ-ḥi; cf. also *BE*, XVII, 26:13, I-li-aḥ-ḥi-e-ri-ba. This plural occurs also in the Amarna letters, Knudtzon, *AT*, No. 8, l. 11, ab-bu-ni; No. 9, l. 7, ab-bu-û-a-a ù ab-bu-ka.

P. 11, l. 26, (i<sup>lu</sup>) Nin-ib-muš [. . . .]. In spite of the definite statement of King (p. 11, n. 3) that nothing is wanting between *ib* and *muš*, it seems to me that the photographic pl. VII shows six little marks before the latter part of the *muš* sign which would permit us to read (i<sup>lu</sup>) Nin-ib-PAP-šir (= nâsir(šir)).

P. 11, l. 40, (m) Iz-kur-e-a. This new reading delivers us fortunately from the unintelligible Is-kal(?) -da-a.

P. 11, l. 47, TIG-EN-NA. For the reading of this title as (amêlu) qadû, "archivist," see Figulla, *Briefwechsel Bêl-ibni's*, p. 40. It is also worthy of note that according to this text (col. III, 6-14, see King, p. 13) the TIG-EN-NA official is commanded to produce the contract tablet of the field of Belâni, which also leads to the inference that he had charge of clay tablets.

P. 14, l. 13, i-na [pa-an] (nâru). According to the note of King (p. 14, n. 5), the traces after ina suggest the reading kišâdât (nâru); pa-an ought to be inserted into the break of the following line, according to note 6.

P. 16, l. 38, a-na ĥur-ša-an. Peiser (*OLZ*, 1911, 478 f.) calls attention to the fact that the form ĥur-ša-an never varies and that it stands in parallelism with a-šar di-en nišê. He therefore proposes to take HUR-ŠA-AN as an ideogram, to be read têtû ša ili, "the oracle of the god." This would explain why, according to this text (col. V, 12-17, King, p. 17) Enlil-nâdin-šum and Aĥu-darû were sent to a place called Parak-mâri, evidently the shrine of a god, and that on their return a report was brought back to the king.

P. 21, l. 5, Ri-zi[ . . ]ni. I would like to propose the reading Ri-zi-[en]-ni, in view of Clay, *Personal Names*, p. 122, Ri-zi-in-ni and Ri-zi-ia-en-ni.

P. 21, l. 5, (amêlu)ka-šu. It seems to me, judging from the photograph, pl. XXV, that the reading ka-lu is possible.

P. 21, l. 10, A-ga-de(ki) is of course the ideogram of the city, written phonetically (alu)Ak-ka-di, cf. p. 17, l. 19; see also Hommel, *Geographie*, p. 400.

P. 21, l. 11, (amêlu)MER-GAL may be read (amêlu)nâgîru rabû, cf. Meissner *SAI*, 4942.

P. 22, l. 11, li-lam-man must be read li-lam-min, lu demands the preterite, see Delitzsch, *Gram.*, p. 214; man has also the value min, Delitzsch, *Lesestücke*<sup>4</sup>, p. 34, No. 277; *Ass. Gram.*<sup>2</sup>, p. 40, and my *New Boundary Stone from Nippur*, p. 320.


P. 23, l. 1, bêt NI-DUB, to be read bêt našpaki, so Schorr, *Altbabyl. Rechtsurkunden*, p. 128; also Meissner, *SAI*, 11499, 11505.

P. 25, l. 1, KI (pl.) can hardly be "low lying." An adjective would follow (še'u)zêru, cf. eqil ki-gal-li, p. 86, l. 2.

P. 25, l. 11. The title after Nazi-(ilu) Marduk is probably (amêlu)sukkallu, cf. col. II, 35, and l. 14 f. Bît-(m.) Tu-na-mi-is-sa-aĥ ša ridûti, for a similar title.

P. 25, l. 11, (alu)Dimâti (pl.). With this reading, which is undoubtedly correct, cf. (alu)Di-in-tu ša (m.) Su-la-ai, cf. Sennach, IV, 56; also Di-in-du [ . . . ] III R 43, I, 27, see King, p. 44, l. 27; and Susa 16, I, 27 (cf. *DEP*, VI, pl. 9; *BE*, XV, 102, 10, AN-ZA-QAR(KI)).

P. 27, l. 28, a-na [ . . ] te-iš-bi-i. It is with hesitation that I express my dissent from such an expert decipherer as Mr. King, but it seems to me that the reading a-na šu-te-iš-bi-i is not out of the question. The sign preceding te, which King says "appears to be ba," has three horizontal wedges, the same number as the last sign in the following line, which must be šu. Besides ba-te-iš-bi-i gives no intelligible sense, šu-te-iš-bi-i, as King acknowledges, is a correct verbal form, Inf.

III, 2 of . There is, therefore, but little doubt in my mind that šu-te-iš-bi-i was intended.

P. 28, l. 12. Here again I express only reluctantly my dissent from King, but the reading, lu lim-nu amêlu, does not seem to me to be correct. I read lu ŠI-NU-TUK=lu lâ šêmâ. The last sign is the only one in doubt. It seems to me to be TUK because it has two upright wedges, on the long horizontal wedge, with nothing between them. It differs considerably from the sign amêlu in col. II, 33 (pl. XXXVI), where the two perpendicular wedges found in TUK are slanting, with another wedge inserted between them. King has adopted the same reading in No. VI, col. II, 34 (p. 35). Here again (see pl. LXXXVIII, l. 5, and pl. LXXXIX, lower part, l. 3) there is no wedge between the two upright wedges. Now compare with this sign col. II, 5 (pl. LXXXVII) where we find the sign amêlu again with the two slanting wedges, and a perpendicular wedge between them. Fortunately there is a TUK sign in one of the next lines (l. 7), which has the two perpendicular wedges, but no wedge between them. Placing pl. LXXXIX immediately under l. 5 of pl. LXXXVII, I have no hesitation in saying that the last sign in col. II, 34, is TUK and not amêlu. If that is the case here, it must also hold good for the parallel passage, p. 28, col. III, 12.

P. 29, l. 44, a-a [iš]-mu-šu. This reading was also suggested by me in my *Selected Kudurru Inscriptions*, p. 21. But after studying the photograph of the passage again, I doubt the correctness of the emendation. The text seems to have da, which is of course out of the question, but why could it not be it, ai it-mu-šu would mean "may they not speak to him," which fits very well into the context. That tamû can be construed with the direct accusative appears from Langdon, *Neu-Babylonische Königs-inschriften*, p. 242, Nab. 3, col. III, 49, li-ta-mi-ka. And perhaps the faint marks under and between the long horizontal wedges of the sign in question may be the remains of an original it. At any rate, even if this is not the case, it would be easier to account for a scribe writing da for it, than substituting da for iš.

P. 31, l. 3, šakkanak (<sup>alu</sup>)Eridu. I was also inclined to read, like Winckler, this phrase šakkanak (<sup>alu</sup>)Bâbili, but for a different reason. As I pointed out (*New Boundary Stone*, p. 129, n. 1) in the new Kudurru from Nippur (col. II, 20) Nebuchadrezzar actually uses the title šakkanak (<sup>alu</sup>)Bâbili, (KÀ-DINGIR-RA) <sup>ki</sup>. Now it seemed difficult to understand why Nebuchadrezzar should have used both titles, if they had been different (unless perchance his family had its origin in Eridu, or he was governor there before he became king). But perhaps King is right after all in insisting that (<sup>alu</sup>)HI=Eri-dug can only be Eridu.

P. 33, l. 50, šarru parsê (pl.) i-šal-ma. As Frank pointed out (ZA, XXII, 101) the ideogram MAŠ-SU(D) demands the reading massû=ášaridu, instead of parsû.

P. 33, l. 60, (<sup>iṣu</sup>)! gišimmarê (pl.). This reading is no doubt due to the supposed resemblance between the two signs following iṣu and the Neo-Babylonian form of the ideogram of gišimmaru, cf. Amiaud-Méchineau, *Tableau Comparé*, No. 278. In the cursive script of the Hammurabi period the sign GIŠIMMAR (Br. 7289) had a similar form, see Ungnad, *Selected Babylonian Business Documents* ("Semitic Study Series," Vol. IX), p. 48, No. 192. For the earlier forms see Thureau-Dangin, *EC*, p. 24, No. 137. But the signs in question (pl. LXXXV, last line) do not correspond to any of these. I would rather propose to read (<sup>iṣu</sup>) šA(G)-KAL=šaggullu or šakkullu, cf. Br. 8046.

P. 35, l. 34, lim-nu amêlu, read lâ šêmâ, see above note to p. 28, l. 12.

P. 39, l. 15, ti-'-u-ti read ti-'-u-ti-ša.

P. 40, l. 35, eqlê (pl.). As Susa 2, III, 11 (*DEP*, Vol. II, pl. 17) is the only passage where the plural of eqlu, as used in the III<sup>d</sup> dynasty, is clearly indicated, A-ŠĀG-tim=eqlâti(m), it is perhaps better to use this plural throughout in the Kudurru inscriptions.

P. 41, l. 18, li-ir-tap-pu-ud, is translated "lie down," but as Frank has shown (*ZA*, XXII, 102), rapâdu means to roam about, hence a roaming spirit is called eṭimmu murtappidu.

P. 43, ll. 4, 10, šar Bâbili, also col. I, 28; Additions col. B, ll. 2, 4. This reading of LUGAL-E seems to me exceedingly doubtful. In the first dynasty LUGAL-E is always to be read šarru. The same phrase occurs dozens of times in Clay's Cassite texts, where it is always read (and no doubt correctly) by Clay šarru. The same should be the reading on the boundary stones. That LUGAL-E is to be read šar Bâbili in neo-Babylonian contract tablets proves nothing for earlier periods and different documents.

P. 45, l. 5. The correct reading of the names Enlil-mušallim-aplu and Apli-ia (l. 16) had already been given in my book, *NBN*, pp. 201, 204.

P. 47, l. 16, si-im-ma la-a-z. Inasmuch as all other passages read the second word la-a-z-za, even Susa 16, VII, 19, see my *Selected Kudurru Inscriptions*, p. 19, we must assume a scribal error in this passage, and consequently transliterate la-a-z-[za]. This text (III R 43) contains many scribal errors, even more than King has indicated, e.g., p. 47, l. 10, daianu, has really only di instead of di-KUD; p. 47, l. 26, in a ḫê-šu the plural sign is omitted.

P. 49, col. A, l. 1, sisê (pl.) mu-ne. The puzzling mu-ne (or MU-NE) seems to mean "its name"="its list"="namely," like MU-BI-IM found so frequently in Clay's Cassite texts at the head of a list of persons. Here it is a list of horses. See also Radau, *BE*, XVII, Part I, p. 83, n. 9, 10; p. 116, n. 6.

P. 51, l. 21, ši-bit al-pi, I also offer this reading in my copy of this text, see *Selected Kudurru Inscriptions*, p. 40. But before ši-bit I thought

I could see an additional horizontal wedge, AŠ=ina, on the cast in the Museum of the University of Pennsylvania. King's plates XLVIII and XLVI clearly show this sign.

P. 51, l. 25, For dab-da-a, see also Scheil, *DEP*, Vol. X, pl. XI, col. I, 25, e-ri-eš dab-di-e. The last word might also be read tab-di-e or tib-di-e. In that case it would have no connection with the word dabdû, "defeat," with which King would like to connect it; cf. also Langdon, *Babyloniaca*, III, p. 145.

P. 59, l. 5, That libbû(-u) meaning "undeveloped land," or something similar, should be connected with the preposition libbû=ina libbi does not appear probable to me.

P. 60, l. 16 (f. <sup>11u</sup>) SAG-mudammik-šar-be. I believe that the name of the deity was not intended for SAG, but šALAM, cf. Br. 6388, 6392 = (<sup>11u</sup>)Šulûlu; see also Meissner, *SAI*, 379. The form of the sign in the Hammurapi period has two downward wedges in front instead of one, as in *SAG*, see Ranke, *BE*, VI, pl. 1. Sign list, No. 5. In col. I, 27 (pl. LXIX, l. 2) and in col. I, 34 (pl. LXIX, l. 9) especially in the latter passage there are distinctly two wedges inside of the first part of the sign. The god Šululu occurs in names of the Hammurabi period, see Ranke, *Personal Names*, p. 219, and his statement on p. 247, n. 5: "The signs KUŠ and SAG sometimes look exactly alike in our texts."

P. 65, l. 18, ša rit-ti. King does not venture to translate rit-tu. But if ši-en-ni (cf. p. 51, l. 22) is equivalent to šênu, rit-ti can be equivalent to rîtu, "pasture," which fits very well in the passages where it occurs, p. 65, l. 18; p. 66, l. 12; *BE*, XIV, 123, 1.

P. 72, l. 22, Comparing this line with Rev. 31 (p. 74), it will be seen that the traces of p. 72, l. 22, are part of the name [Mu-š]e-zib-(<sup>11u</sup>) [Marduk].

P. 73, l. 10, a-na ma-ḥar šarri il-su-ma, cannot be translated "he spoke in the presence of the king," but the whole sentence must be read: "Nabu-ušallim, the son of Dakuru, into the presence of the king he called and concerning the restitution of this field faithfully he que[stioned] him." Read the last verb iš-t[a-'-al-]šu.

P. 75, l. 49, (<sup>11u</sup>)Sin-ikribê-iš-me, is a possible reading, but it should be noted that the phonetic spelling: (<sup>11u</sup>)Sin-ka-rab-iš-me occurs (VA, 2663, V, 12) and that sigiř has also the meaning karâbu, cf. Meissner, *SAI*, 6842; see also for similar readings Clay, *Personal Names*, pp. 125, 180.

P. 75, l. 46, (<sup>amêlu</sup>)TU bîti, to be read (<sup>amêlu</sup>)šâbit bîti, "the temple sweeper," cf. Langdon in *Babyloniaca*, II, 285.

P. 77, l. 3, Instead of piḥât tâmti (KI) ru-bu-u ir-du-ud-ma, we must read piḥât tâmti qi-ru-bu-u ir-du-ud-ma, and translate: "(Five gur of cornland) . . . in the province of the Sea Country, arable land, he marked out." For this reading, cf. *New Boundary Stone of Nebuchadrezzar*, p. 146, l. 25; p. 173; and below, note to p. 92, l. 17.



P. 77, l. 9, URU-KA-KAL, may be a scribal error for URU-SAG-KAL = ardu ašaridu.

P. 78, l. 15, ibni-ma, perhaps better êpuš-ma, see p. 116, l. 5. Banû is used of statues. Was it also used of stone tablets?

P. 79, l. 6, This line may be completed to še-ri-is-su rabîta(-ta) [li-mi-is-su], as King indicates in his translation.


P. 86, l. 6, šu-up-pa-a-ti, is the plural of šuppatu, most likely a variant form of šippatu, "the orchard," cf. also Susa 16, I, 31 (*DEP*, VI, pl. 9).

P. 86, l. 7, The form si-ri-bi occurs also in Clay's *Cassite Texts*, *BE*, XIV, 56a (pl. 57), l. 22 (*m d*) Sin-ša qû ša si-ri-bi; *BE*, XIV, 98:11, (*m*) Ub-bu-ul-ti-li-ši-ir ša si-ri-bi; *BE*, XIV, 148, Rev. 43, ša si-ri-bi-šu ša šarri. It is the title of an official.

P. 92, l. 17, eqlu KI-SUB-BI-E, should be read eqlu qi-ru-bi-e, in view of eqlu qi-ru-ba-a, of the Nippur stone, II, 25. This throws light on eqlu KI-SUB-BU-E on p. 109, l. 1, which proves to be a scribal error for qi-ru-bi-e or qi-ru-bu-u, see Streck, *ZA*, XVIII, 174<sup>2</sup>; and my *New Boundary Stone*, pp. 173, 303. See also above note to p. 77, l. 3.

P. 97, l. 15, eql še-pir(?) -ti, must probably be connected with ši-pir-ti, p. 74, l. 31. Before seeing King's latest copy of the Šamaš-šum-ukîn text, I read p. 74, l. 31, [ka-ni-]ik ši-pir-ti, which I connected with (abnu)kunuk šarri ša šip-ri-e-ti, p. 106, l. 27; p. 126, l. 31. This seems now impossible, if the space of the broken signs on pl. 9, l. 31, is given correctly. A meaning like "fief land" would suit eql še-pir-ti very well.

P. 97, l. 34, With regard to the doubtful sign in this line, Meissner calls attention (Meissner, *SAI*, 11501) to the fact that in the Amarna letters (cf. Knudtzon, *AT*, No. 131, 21) the sign MAŠKIM (Br. 5659) is glossed ma-lik (pl.). It is written with or without pa, which usually forms the first part of the sign. See Knudtzon, *loc. cit.*, p. 557, n. q. Now the two signs SUH (Br. 4810) and KAS (Br. 4819) can be exchanged. Both have

the value KAS, cf. mar- = mar-kas, see *BA*, VI, 142, 15.

Moreover, the sign in question (King, p. 97, l. 34) ought to be identified with KAS (Br. 4819). It is DU+ŠE, the latter part, instead of being written in the sign, is placed above and beneath it. Accordingly, with a mêlu prefixed, as in the Amarna letters, its probable reading is mâliku.

P. 99, l. 40, In view of šip-ri-e-ti, p. 106, l. 27, and p. 126, l. 31, we should read in this line ša šip-[ri-e]-ti.

P. 102, l. 3, (*m*), Ri-ba-(ilu) Sin. This name, I believe, should be read (*m*)Eri-ba-(*ilu*)Sin, in view of the following phonetic spellings: Sin-i-ri-ba(*am*), I-li-aḥ-ḥi-e-ri-ba, E-ri-bu(*bi*), E-ri-bu-ni, I-ri-ba(-a)-tum, I-ri-bu, see Clay, *Personal Names*, pp. 85, 125, 176.

Notice especially that Sin-i-ri-ba and Sin-eri-ba are both found in the Cassite texts (see Clay, *loc. cit.*, p. 125). This agrees also with the forms in use in the first dynasty, cf. Sin-e-ri-ba-am, Ranke, *Personal Names*, p. 155. The sign URU has the phonetic value eri, which was also, most likely, used in the divine name <sup>(ilu)</sup>Eri-ia, p. 96, l. 2; p. 97, ll. 18, 25, 30.

P. 102, l. 8, (<sup>amêlu</sup>)<sub>TU-E</sub>, read amêlu šâbit-bîti, cf. above note to p. 75, l. 46; so also p. 105, l. 2; p. 119, l. 14; p. 125, ll. 20, 38.

P. 105, l. 21, (m) Aḥu-ri-ba read Aḥu-eri-ba, cf. note to p. 102, l. 3.

P. 105, l. 22, Tam-ma-šad-dar, must be read Tu-ba-laṭ-Ištar, cf. the name Tu(?) -ba-laṭ-Ištar, p. 126, l. 23. But the question mark after Tu may safely be omitted. It is a correct name, meaning: "Thou givest life, O Ištar."

P. 106, l. 24, (m-) Ri-ba(-ilu)-Marduk, read (m-) Eri-ba(-ilu) Marduk.

P. 107, l. 6, (m ilu) Bêl-ri-ba, read (m ilu) Bêl-eri-ba.

P. 121, note 2. The label above the symbols must be read, as Weidner has pointed out recently (*OLZ*, 1913, 87): (1) <sup>(ilu)</sup>Sin <sup>(ilu)</sup>Šamaš u <sup>(ilu)</sup>Ištar ina pu-ut apsî (2) ina bi-rit ili šîri ti-mi inadû<sup>(pl.)</sup>, i.e., "moon, sun, and Ishtar [are] over against the ocean, (2) between the god, the serpent [and] the pillar they lie." It is a description of the three symbols above the tiara of Shamash. The serpent is behind and above Shamash, the pillar before him and the ocean below. The inscription under the symbols is: agû <sup>(ilu)</sup>Šamaš (2) šîru pân do, i.e., "the tiara of Shamash, the serpent before it." The head of the serpent (which forms the back and top of the shrine in which the god sits) is immediately before the headdress of the god.

P. 126, l. 22, (m ilu) Marduk-tabik-zêru, read (m ilu) Marduk-šapik-zêru, cf. p. 81, col. II, l. 4, (m ilu) Marduk-ša-bi-ik-zêru.

P. 126, l. 40, piḥâti cannot be rendered "governor"; bêl pa(i) ḥâti (EN-NAM) is governor, but NAM=piḥâtu is province.

P. 126, l. 20, (m) Ittabši-ilu. A better reading is Mušabši-ilu, cf. p. 45, 15 and especially p. 110, l. 21 (m) Mu-šab-ši(-ilu) Marduk.

In conclusion, a few misprints and minor inaccuracies of transcription may be mentioned:

P. 13, col. III, 5, Ur-Bêlit-muballiṭat-mûti, read Ur-(ilu) Bêlit-muballiṭat-miti.

P. 13, col. III, 17, aš-šu ka-at read aš-šu ḳa-at.

P. 14, col. III, 34, (m ilu) En-lil-ib-ni read (m ilu) En-lil-im-bi.

P. 17, col. V, 19, te-im-šu, read ṭe-im-šu.

P. 18, col. VI, 19, a-na kakki, read a-na <sup>(iṣu)</sup>kakki.

P. 26, col. II, 3, (m ilu) Arad(-ilu) E-a read (m) Arad(-ilu)-Ea.

P. 29, col. III, 41, lik-ti-ma, read liḳ-ti-ma.

P. 31, col. I, 9, i-na kakki, read i-na <sup>(iṣu)</sup>kakki.

- P. 33, l. 60, gišimmare, read (iṣu)gišimmare.  
 P. 37, n. 4, Hinke read Hinke, same correction p. vii.  
 P. 39, col. I, 22, GIŠ-BAR 4 (qa) read GIŠ-BAR 4 qa.  
 P. 45, col. III, 5, i-na muḥḥi eqli, read i-na eli eqli; muḥḥi is written muḥ-ḥi; see p. 46, col. III, 23; p. 48, l. 6.  
 P. 48, l. 6, ilâni, read ilâni (pl.).  
 P. 58, l. 20, [šak]in-te-me-mâti, read [šak]in-ṭe-me-mâti.  
 P. 61, l. 33, 3 GUR zêru, read 3 GUR (še'u) zêru.  
 P. 61, l. 38, (ilu) Ea ilâni rabûti (pl.), read (ilu) Ea ilâni (pl.) rabûti (pl.).  
 P. 72, Rev. 3, siḥ-maš-ti read saḥ-maš-ti, the form sa-aḥ-ma-aš-tu occurs.  
 P. 77, l. 11, gu-za-an-nu, read ḥa-za-an-nu, same correction, p. 78, l. 2.  
 P. 103, l. 11, i-na muḥḥi, read ina eli, see above, note to p. 45.

WM. J. HINKE

#### MACALISTER'S HISTORY OF CIVILIZATION IN PALESTINE<sup>1</sup>

This volume is one of the excellent series of scientific monographs, written by first-rate authorities, which the Cambridge University Press is issuing. These volumes serve a most useful purpose by placing within reach of the laymen the latest and best information on the subjects of which they treat, expressed in untechnical terms. The volume before us is one of the most useful of the series, and well maintains the high standard set by some of its predecessors. Professor Macalister is peculiarly fitted to write such a book as this. While not a specialist in either the Old or New Testament, he is familiar with the best results of biblical research, and he is a specialist, not only in the particular field of Palestinian archaeology, to which he has made some of the most notable contributions of recent years, but of archaeology in the broader sense. His wider view of the archaeology of the Stone age gives to his book a breadth of view and a perspective which are rare in volumes which deal with biblical subjects.

The subject is treated under the following headings, which form the titles of the successive chapters: "Palestine and Its Earliest Inhabitants," "The Later Stone Age in Palestine," "The Pre-Israelite Semitic Occupations," "The First Struggle of West and East," "The Hebrew Monarchy," "The Captivities and After," "The Growth of the Religious Consciousness in Israel," "Roman and Byzantine," "The Last Struggle of West and East," and "Till Yesterday." It will be seen from this list of subjects that the reader is given a glimpse of the changes which have passed over this important and

<sup>1</sup> A HISTORY OF CIVILIZATION IN PALESTINE. By R. A. S. Macalister, M.A., F.S.A., Professor of Celtic Archaeology, University College, Dublin, Sometime Director of Excavations, Palestine Exploration Fund. Cambridge: University Press, 1912. Small 8vo, pp. viii + 139. 2s. 6d.